Non-interacting two-impurity Anderson model on a lattice at particle-hole symmetry

Zakaria M.M. Mahmoud[1,2], Jörg Bünemann[3], Florian Gebhard[*,1]

[1] Fachbereich Physik, Philipps-Universität Marburg, D-35032 Marburg, Germany
[2] Department of Physics, New-Valley Faculty of Science, El-Kharga, Assiut University, Egypt
[3] Institut für Physik, BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg, D-03013 Cottbus, Germany

Version of December 16, 2016, to be submitted

Received XXXX, revised XXXX, accepted XXXX
Published online XXXX

Key words: Impurity scattering, RKKY interaction.

[*] Corresponding author: e-mail florian.gebhard@physik.uni-marburg.de, Phone: +49-6421-2821318, Fax: +49-6421-2824511

We study the non-interacting two-impurity Anderson model on a lattice using the Green function equation-of-motion method. A case of particular interest is the RKKY limit that is characterized by a small hybridization between impurities and host electrons and the absence of a direct coupling between the impurities. In contrast to the low-density case, at half band-filling and particle-hole symmetry, the RKKY interaction decays as the inverse square of the impurity distance along the axis of a simple cubic lattice. In the RKKY limit, for the spectral function we generically observe a small splitting of the single-impurity resonance into two peaks. For a vanishing density-density correlation function of the host electrons, we find only a broadened single peak in the local density of states.

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

arXiv:1612.06123v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 19 Dec 2016

1 Introduction Impurities diluted in a metallic host pose a fundamental problem in solid-state theory [1]. A famous example is the formation of a 'Kondo cloud' around a magnetic impurity in a metallic host that leads to a complete screening of a spin-1/2 impurity at zero temperature and to a very narrow Abrikosov-Suhl resonance in the single-particle density of states [2]. The formation of a magnetic impurity and its screening by the host electrons is contained in the single-impurity Anderson model [3]; for a review, see Ref. [2], and references therein.

A single (magnetic) impurity induces distortions in the host electrons' charge and spin density ('Friedel oscillations') [4, 5]. These distortions can be sensed by a second (magnetic) impurity so that the host electrons generate an effective interaction between the impurities, known as RKKY interaction, named after Ruderman and Kittel [6], Kasuya [7], and Yosida [8]; for a concise derivation from perturbation theory, see appendix I of [1].

The combined physics of the Kondo effect and of the RKKY interaction is contained in the two-impurity Anderson model (TIAM) [9]. It describes two impurities embedded in a metallic host at lattice sites $\mathbf{R}_1$ and $\mathbf{R}_2$. When the local Hubbard interaction on the impurities is strong, the model covers the local Kondo physics and the RKKY interaction between magnetic impurities. However, the TIAM is a true many-particle problem that cannot be solved in general; for a recent investigation using an extended non-crossing approximation, see Ref. [10], and references therein.

The TIAM is frequently invoked in studies of coupled quantum dots where each dot represents an impurity, see Ref. [11] for a recent study. However, the quantum dots have individual leads, i.e., there are two independent host metals so that the indirect exchange interaction is different from the solid-state case for which the TIAM was designed originally. Moreover, the direct coupling between

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

the quantum dots is generically large and dominates over the RKKY interaction.

In the present work, we consider the non-interacting two-impurity Anderson model that can be solved exactly using the Green function equation-of-motion method [9]. In contrast to the perturbative RKKY derivation, the results include the full impurity-host hybridization and multiple scattering events of the host electrons off the impurities to all orders. The formulae provide the basis of a Gutzwiller approach to the TIAM which permits a variational analysis of the competition between the single-impurity Kondo effect and the two-impurity RKKY interaction [12]. For this reason, we are particularly interested in the case of particle-hole symmetry at half band-filling.

To study the competition between single-impurity and two-impurity physics, we focus on the RKKY limit of a small, local hybridization in the absence of a direct electron transfer between the impurities. This case was not worked out in detail in Ref. [9] where the impurities were dominantly coupled by a direct electron transfer. Although we cannot study the formation of a local moments, we determine the effective RKKY interaction of the (non-interacting) impurities as a function of their separation fully analytically. We find that the RKKY interaction generically leads to two peaks in the single-particle density of states, i.e., the host metal generates a small but finite transfer matrix element between the impurities.

Our work is organized as follows. We formulate the two-impurity Anderson model in section 2. In section 3 we solve the non-interacting model using the equation-of-motion method for the retarded Green functions [9]. We introduce and utilize particle-hole symmetry in section 4, and work out the impurity properties for tight-binding host electrons on a simple-cubic lattice in detail in section 5. Short conclusions, section 6, end our presentation. Some technical details are deferred to the appendix.

2 Two-impurity Anderson model We start our investigations with the definition of the Hamiltonian. Then, we rephrase the problem in terms of a single-site two-orbital model.

2.1 Hamiltonian Two impurities in a metallic host on a lattice are modeled by the Hamiltonian [9]

$$\hat{H} = \hat{T} + \hat{T}_d + \hat{H}_{\rm int} + \hat{V} \ . \tag{1}$$

Here, $\hat{T}$ is the kinetic energy of the non-interacting spin-1/2 host electrons ($\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$),

$$\hat{T} = \sum_{\mathbf{R},\mathbf{R}';\sigma} t(\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}') \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R}',\sigma} \ , \tag{2}$$

where the electrons tunnel between the sites $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{R}'$ of the lattice with amplitude $t(\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}')$. The kinetic energy is diagonal in Fourier space. For $\mathbf{k}$ from the first Brillouin zone we define

$$\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} \ , \ \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \ , \tag{3}$$

where L is the (even) number of lattice sites. With

$$t(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \ , \ \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{R}} t(\mathbf{R}) e^{-{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \tag{4}$$

we find

$$\hat{T} = \sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \ , \tag{5}$$

where $\epsilon(\mathbf{k})$ is the dispersion relation.

With $\hat{T}_d$ we also permit a direct electron transfer with amplitude t_{12} between the impurity orbitals at sites $\mathbf{R}_1$ and $\mathbf{R}_2$,

$$\hat{T}_d = \sum_{\sigma} t_{12} \hat{d}^+_{1,\sigma} \hat{d}_{2,\sigma} + t^*_{12} \hat{d}^+_{2,\sigma} \hat{d}_{1,\sigma} \ . \tag{6}$$

Next, $\hat{H}_{\rm int}$ represents the Hubbard interaction to model the Coulomb repulsion on the impurities,

$$\hat{H}_{\rm int} = U \sum_{b=1}^{2} (\hat{n}_{b,\uparrow} - 1/2)(\hat{n}_{b,\downarrow} - 1/2) \ , \tag{7}$$

where $\hat{n}_{b,\sigma} = \hat{d}^+_{b,\sigma} \hat{d}_{b,\sigma}$ counts the number of impurity electrons ($b = 1, 2$).

Lastly, $\hat{V}$ describes the hybridization between impurity and host electron states,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V} &= \sum_{\mathbf{R},b,\sigma} V(\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_b) \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} \hat{d}_{b,\sigma} + V^*(\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}_b) \hat{d}^+_{b,\sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{\mathbf{k},b,\sigma} V_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_b} \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \hat{d}_{b,\sigma} + V^*_{\mathbf{k}} e^{{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_b} \hat{d}^+_{b,\sigma} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} \ , \\ V_{\mathbf{k}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{R}} V(\mathbf{R}) e^{-{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \ , \ V(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{{\rm i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} V_{\mathbf{k}} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The model (1) poses a difficult many-particle problem that cannot be solved in general.

2.2 Single-site two-orbital model As a second step, we map the two-impurity model onto an asymmetric two-orbital model.

2.2.1 Kinetic energy of d-electrons We introduce the h-basis for the impurity electrons using the unitary transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}^+_{1,\sigma} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\hat{h}^+_{1,\sigma} + \alpha_{12} \hat{h}^+_{2,\sigma} \right) \ , \\ \hat{d}^+_{2,\sigma} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \left(-\alpha^*_{12} \hat{h}^+_{1,\sigma} + \hat{h}^+_{2,\sigma} \right) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$\alpha_{12} = \frac{t^*_{12}}{|t_{12}|} \quad , \quad \alpha^2_{12} = \frac{t^*_{12}}{t_{12}} \ . \tag{10}$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

The inverse transformation reads

$$\hat{h}^+_{1,\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\hat{d}^+_{1,\sigma} - \alpha_{12}\hat{d}^+_{2,\sigma}\right) ,$$
$$\hat{h}^+_{2,\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\alpha^*_{12}\hat{d}^+_{1,\sigma} + \hat{d}^+_{2,\sigma}\right) .$$

Then, $\hat{T}_d$, eq. (6), is diagonal in the h-basis,

$$\hat{T}_d = |t_{12}|\left(\hat{h}^+_{2,\sigma}\hat{h}_{2,\sigma} - \hat{h}^+_{1,\sigma}\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}\right) . \quad (11)$$

In this representation, $\hat{T}_d$ has the form of a splitting of two impurity levels on the same site.

For a unitary transformation we have

$$\hat{d}^+_{1,\sigma}\hat{d}_{1,\sigma} + \hat{d}^+_{2,\sigma}\hat{d}_{2,\sigma} = \hat{h}^+_{1,\sigma}\hat{h}_{1,\sigma} + \hat{h}^+_{2,\sigma}\hat{h}_{2,\sigma} . \quad (12)$$

Therefore, the average number of d_σ-electrons equals the average number of h_σ-electrons.

2.2.2 Hybridization In the h-basis, the hybridization $\hat{V}$, see eq. (8), takes the form

$$\hat{V} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_{\mathbf{k},b,\sigma} V_{\mathbf{k},b}\hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\hat{h}_{b,\sigma} + V^*_{\mathbf{k},b}\hat{h}^+_{b,\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} . \quad (13)$$

The two impurity levels hybridize with the conduction electrons with the matrix elements

$$V_{\mathbf{k},1} = \frac{V_\mathbf{k}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_1} - \alpha_{12}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_2}\right) ,$$
$$V_{\mathbf{k},2} = \frac{V_\mathbf{k}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\alpha^*_{12}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_1} + e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_2}\right) . \quad (14)$$

We do not elaborate $\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}$ in the new basis because we restrict ourselves to the non-interacting model in the following.

3 Green functions for the non-interacting model

For $U = 0$ in (1), the single-particle Green functions can be calculated exactly using the equation-of-motion method. From the Green functions, all ground-state properties and the single-particle density of states can be derived.

3.1 Definition The retarded Green functions for the host electrons and the impurity electrons read

$$G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p};\sigma}(t) = (-\mathrm{i})\Theta(t)\langle\Phi_0|\left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t), \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{p},\sigma}\right]_+|\Phi_0\rangle , \quad (15)$$

$$G_{b,b';\sigma}(t) = (-\mathrm{i})\Theta(t)\langle\Phi_0|\left[\hat{h}_{b,\sigma}(t), \hat{h}^+_{b',\sigma}\right]_+|\Phi_0\rangle , \quad (16)$$

where $|\Phi_0\rangle$ is the ground state for $U = 0$, $\Theta(t)$ is the Heaviside step function, $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_+ = \hat{A}\hat{B} + \hat{B}\hat{A}$ is the anti-commutator, and

$$\hat{A}(t) = e^{\mathrm{i}\hat{H}t}\hat{A}e^{-\mathrm{i}\hat{H}t} \quad (17)$$

describes the time evolution of a Schrödinger operator $\hat{A}$ in the Heisenberg picture; we set $\hbar \equiv 1$ for convenience.

The host and impurity Green functions in eqs. (15) and (16) couple to the mixed Green functions

$$G_{b,\mathbf{k};\sigma}(t) = (-\mathrm{i})\Theta(t)\langle\Phi_0|\left[\hat{h}_{b,\sigma}(t), \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\right]_+|\Phi_0\rangle , \quad (18)$$

$$G_{\mathbf{k},b;\sigma}(t) = (-\mathrm{i})\Theta(t)\langle\Phi_0|\left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t), \hat{h}^+_{b,\sigma}\right]_+|\Phi_0\rangle , \quad (19)$$

when we set up the equations of motion.

3.2 Equations of motion The time derivatives of the single-electron Heisenberg operators read

$$\mathrm{i}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t) = e^{\mathrm{i}\hat{H}t}\left[\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t), \hat{H}\right]_- e^{-\mathrm{i}\hat{H}t}$$
$$= \epsilon(\mathbf{k})\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_b V_{\mathbf{k},b}\hat{h}_{b,\sigma}(t) , \quad (20)$$

$$\mathrm{i}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}(t) = -|t_{12}|\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_\mathbf{k} V^*_{\mathbf{k},1}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t) , \quad (21)$$

$$\mathrm{i}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\hat{h}_{2,\sigma}(t) = |t_{12}|\hat{h}_{2,\sigma}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_\mathbf{k} V^*_{\mathbf{k},2}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}(t) . \quad (22)$$

Moreover, we define the Fourier transformation for a retarded Green function $g(t)$ ($\omega \equiv \omega + \mathrm{i}\eta$, $\eta = 0^+$)

$$g(\omega) = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t e^{\mathrm{i}\omega t}g(t) , \; g(t) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi}e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega t}g(\omega) . \quad (23)$$

With these equations it is possible to derive a closed set of algebraic equations for the Green functions. For later use, we define the bare Green functions

$$g_\mathbf{k}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})} ,$$
$$g_1(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega + |t_{12}|} ,$$
$$g_2(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - |t_{12}|} \quad (24)$$

that appear in the absence of the hybridization, $V_\mathbf{k} = 0$.

3.2.1 Host electrons The first set of equations involves the host electrons,

$$\mathrm{i}\dot{G}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}}(t) = \delta(t)\delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}} + \epsilon(\mathbf{k})G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}}(t)$$
$$+\sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_b V_{\mathbf{k},b}G_{b,\mathbf{p}}(t) ,$$

$$\mathrm{i}\dot{G}_{1,\mathbf{p}}(t) = -|t_{12}|G_{1,\mathbf{p}}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_\mathbf{k} V^*_{\mathbf{k},1}G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}}(t) ,$$

$$\mathrm{i}\dot{G}_{2,\mathbf{p}}(t) = |t_{12}|G_{2,\mathbf{p}}(t) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_\mathbf{k} V^*_{\mathbf{k},2}G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}}(t) , \quad (25)$$

where we dropped the spin index for convenience. After Fourier transformation, we find that

$$G_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) = A_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega)g_b(\omega) \quad (26)$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

with

$$A_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} V^*_{\mathbf{k},b} G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}}(\omega) \tag{27}$$

so that the host Green function obeys

$$G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}}(\omega) = g_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)\Big(\delta_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{b} V_{\mathbf{k},b} A_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) g_b(\omega)\Big) \; . \tag{28}$$

When we insert this expression into eq. (27) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} V^*_{\mathbf{p},b} g_{\mathbf{p}}(\omega) + A_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) g_{b,\sigma}(\omega) H_{b,b}(\omega) \\ + A_{\bar{b},\mathbf{p}}(\omega) g_{\bar{b}}(\omega) H_{\bar{b},b}(\omega) \; , \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where we introduced the notation $\bar{1} = 2$ and $\bar{2} = 1$, and the hybridization matrix functions

$$H_{b,b'}(\omega) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{V_{\mathbf{k},b} V^*_{\mathbf{k},b'}}{\omega - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})} \; . \tag{30}$$

The resulting 2×2 matrix problem (29) for fixed frequency ω and fixed Bloch momentum $\mathbf{p}$ is readily solved to give

$$g_b(\omega) A_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) = \frac{Z_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)} \; , \tag{31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{b,\mathbf{p}}(\omega) &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} V^*_{\mathbf{p},b} g_{\mathbf{p}}(\omega) \left(g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega)\right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} V^*_{\mathbf{p},\bar{b}} g_{\mathbf{p}}(\omega) H_{\bar{b},b}(\omega) \; , \\ \Delta(\omega) &= \left(g^{-1}_2(\omega) - H_{2,2}(\omega)\right) \left(g^{-1}_1(\omega) - H_{1,1}(\omega)\right) \\ &\quad - H_{1,2}(\omega) H_{2,1}(\omega) \; . \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The trace over all $\mathbf{k}$-states results in the average host Green function

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}} G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}(\omega) = G_{\sigma,0}(\omega) + \Delta G^{\rm host}_{\sigma}(\omega) \tag{33}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\sigma,0}(\omega) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) \; , \\ \Delta G^{\rm host}_{\sigma}(\omega) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k},b} \frac{[g_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)]^2 V_{\mathbf{k},b} V^*_{\mathbf{k},b}}{L\Delta(\omega)} \left(g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{[g_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)]^2 V_{\mathbf{k},b} V^*_{\mathbf{k},\bar{b}}}{L\Delta(\omega)} H_{\bar{b},b}(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{b} \frac{g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)} \left(-H'_{b,b}(\omega)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{H_{\bar{b},b}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)} \left(-H'_{b,\bar{b}}(\omega)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

with $H'_{b,b'}(\omega) = (\partial H_{b,b'}(\omega))/(\partial\omega)$. We need the average host Green function for the calculation of the ground-state energy and the impurity contribution to the density of states.

3.2.2 Impurity electrons After Fourier transformation the equations of motion for the impurity Green functions read

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}_b(\omega) G_{b,b'}(\omega) &= \delta_{b,b'} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} V^*_{\mathbf{k},b} G_{\mathbf{k},b'}(\omega) \; , \\ g^{-1}_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega) G_{\mathbf{k},b}(\omega) &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}} \sum_{b'} V_{\mathbf{k},b'} G_{b',b}(\omega) \; . \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

We insert the second equation into the first to obtain

$$g^{-1}_b(\omega) G_{b,b'}(\omega) = \delta_{b,b'} + \sum_{b''} H_{b'',b}(\omega) G_{b'',b'}(\omega) \; . \tag{36}$$

The solution of this 2×2 matrix problem for fixed ω gives

$$G_{b,\bar{b}}(\omega) = \frac{H_{\bar{b},b}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)} \; , \tag{37}$$

and

$$G_{b,b}(\omega) = \frac{g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)} \; . \tag{38}$$

For our further investigations, the diagonal impurity Green functions in eq. (38) are sufficient.

3.3 Ground-state expectation values Lastly, we use the Green functions to calculate the impurity contribution to the single-particle density of states. In addition, we derive the ground-state energy, impurity density, and hybridization energy.

3.3.1 Density of states and ground-state energy We introduce the single-particle density of states

$$D_{\sigma}(\omega) = \sum_{\alpha} \delta(\omega - E_{\alpha}) \; , \tag{39}$$

where E_{α} are the energies of the single-particle levels. We introduce the exact single-particle and single-hole excitations of the ground state $|\alpha\rangle \equiv \hat{a}^{(+)}_{\alpha,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle$,

$$\hat{H}\hat{a}^{(+)}_{\alpha,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle = (E_0 \pm E_{\alpha})\hat{a}^{(+)}_{\alpha,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle \; , \tag{40}$$

where E_0 is the energy of the ground state $|\Phi_0\rangle$. Then, the single-particle density of states can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\sigma}(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi}{\rm Im}\Bigg[&\langle\Phi_0|\hat{a}^{+}_{\alpha,\sigma} \frac{1}{\omega - (\hat{H} - E_0) + {\rm i}\eta} \hat{a}_{\alpha,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle \\ &+ \langle\Phi_0|\hat{a}_{\alpha,\sigma} \frac{1}{\omega - (\hat{H} - E_0) + {\rm i}\eta} \hat{a}^{+}_{\alpha,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle \Bigg] \; . \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The sum on all single-particle excitations is equivalent to the trace over the subspace of all single-particle excitations,

$$D_{\sigma}(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi}{\rm Im}{\rm Tr}_1 \left[\frac{1}{\omega - (\hat{H} - E_0) + {\rm i}\eta} \right] \; . \tag{42}$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

We can equally use the excitations $\hat{c}^{(+)}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle$ and $\hat{h}^{(+)}_{b,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle$ to perform the trace over the single-particle excitations of the ground state. Therefore, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} D_\sigma(\omega) &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[\sum_{\mathbf{k}} G_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}(\omega) + \sum_b G_{b,b}(\omega)\right] \\ &= D_{\sigma,0}(\omega) + \Delta D^{\mathrm{host}}_\sigma(\omega) + \sum_b D_{b,\sigma}(\omega) \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

with

$$D_{\sigma,0}(\omega) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta\big(\omega - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})\big) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{Im}\left[g_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)\right] \ . \tag{44}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{b,\sigma}(\omega) &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[G_{b,b}(\omega)\right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)}\right] , \\ \Delta D^{\mathrm{host}}_\sigma(\omega) &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[\Delta G^{\mathrm{host}}_\sigma(\omega)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

with $g_b(\omega)$ from eq. (24), $H_{b,b'}(\omega)$ from eq. (30), and $\Delta G^{\mathrm{host}}_\sigma(\omega)$ from eq. (34). Therefore, we find

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathrm{imp},\sigma}(\omega) &= D_\sigma(\omega) - D_{\sigma,0}(\omega) \\ &= \Delta D^{\mathrm{host}}_\sigma(\omega) + \sum_b D_{b,\sigma}(\omega) \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

for the contribution to the density of states that originates from the impurities and their hybridization to the host electrons.

The change in the ground-state energy contribution due to the hybridization between host electrons and impurities is given by

$$\Delta E_0 = 2\sum_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{occ}} \left(E_\alpha - \epsilon_\alpha\right) \ , \tag{47}$$

where E_α (ϵ_α) are the single-particle energies in the presence (absence) of the hybridization $V_{\mathbf{k}}$, and the factor two accounts for the spin degeneracy. With the help of the density of states it is readily calculated from

$$\Delta E_0 = 2\left[|t_{12}| + \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\omega\omega D_{\mathrm{imp},\sigma}(\omega)\right] . \tag{48}$$

3.3.2 Particle density and hybridization energy In general, for the retarded Green function

$$G_{A,B}(t) = (-\mathrm{i})\Theta(t)\langle\Phi_0|\left[\hat{A}(t), \hat{B}^+\right]_+|\Phi_0\rangle \tag{49}$$

we obtain its Fourier transformation as

$$\begin{aligned} G_{A,B}(\omega) = \langle\Phi_0|\hat{A}\frac{1}{\omega + E_0 - \hat{H} + \mathrm{i}\eta}\hat{B}^+|\Phi_0\rangle \\ +\langle\Phi_0|\hat{B}^+\frac{1}{\omega - E_0 + \hat{H} + \mathrm{i}\eta}\hat{A}|\Phi_0\rangle \ . \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

The corresponding density of states is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{A,B}(\omega) &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[G_{A,B}(\omega)\right] \\ &= \langle\Phi_0|\hat{A}\delta(\omega + E_0 - \hat{H})\hat{B}^+|\Phi_0\rangle \\ &\quad +\langle\Phi_0|\hat{B}^+\delta(\omega - E_0 + \hat{H})\hat{A}|\Phi_0\rangle \ . \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

The first term is finite only if $\omega > 0$ because $E_\alpha > E_0$ for the eigenenergies of $\hat{H}$. Therefore,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\omega D_{A,B}(\omega) = \langle\Phi_0|\hat{B}^+\hat{A}|\Phi_0\rangle \tag{52}$$

for the ground-state expectation value of the operator product $\hat{B}^+\hat{A}$.

As an example, we give explicit expressions for the impurity occupancies,

$$\begin{aligned} n_{b,\sigma} &= \langle\Phi_0|\hat{h}^+_{b,\sigma}\hat{h}_{b,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{0}\mathrm{d}\omega D_{b,\sigma}(\omega) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\mathrm{d}\omega\mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)}\right] . \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

For the hybridization matrix element we find

$$\langle\Phi_0|\hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\hat{h}_{b,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{0}\mathrm{d}\omega D_{b,\mathbf{k}}(\omega) \ , \tag{54}$$

where

$$D_{b,\mathbf{k}}(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[G_{b,\mathbf{k}}(\omega)\right] = -\frac{1}{\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{Z_{b,\mathbf{k}}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)}\right] , \tag{55}$$

see eq. (32). The hybridization energy reads

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathrm{hyb}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k},b,\sigma} V_{\mathbf{k},b}\langle\Phi_0|\hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\hat{h}_{b,\sigma}|\Phi_0\rangle + \mathrm{c.c.} \\ &= -\frac{4}{\pi}\sum_b\int_{-\infty}^{0}\mathrm{d}\omega\mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{H_{b,\bar{b}}H_{\bar{b},b}(\omega)}{\Delta(\omega)}\right] \\ &\qquad + \mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{H_{b,b}(\omega)(g^{-1}_{\bar{b}}(\omega) - H_{\bar{b},\bar{b}}(\omega))}{\Delta(\omega)}\right] . \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Note that the integrals in eqs. (48), (53) and (56) range over a finite interval because the host bandwidth is finite.

4 Particle-hole symmetry at half band-filling We are interested in the case where there is on average one electron on each of the impurities. This can be assured for a particle-hole symmetric Hamiltonian (1) at half band-filling.

4.1 Conditions We consider a bipartite lattice. We assume that there exists half a reciprocal lattice vector $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{G}/2$ for which

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}\pm\mathbf{Q}) = -\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \ , \ e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } \mathbf{R}\in A\text{-lattice} \\ -1 \text{ if } \mathbf{R}\in B\text{-lattice} \end{cases} . \tag{57}$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

We also assume inversion symmetry, $\epsilon(-\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon(\mathbf{k})$; recall that $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{G}) = \epsilon(\mathbf{k})$. For the electron transfer matrix elements between two sites at distance $\mathbf{R}$ this implies

$$\begin{aligned} t(\mathbf{R}) &= \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathrm{MBZ}} \left(e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} - e^{\mathrm{i}(\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{R}}\right)\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where MBZ is the reduced (or 'magnetic') Brillouin zone that contains only half of the vectors of the Brillouin zone.

Consequently, the electron transfer matrix elements between sites on the same sublattice ($\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice) ought to be imaginary, and those between sites on different sublattices ($\mathbf{R} \in B$-lattice) must be real,

$$\begin{aligned} t(\mathbf{R}\in A) &= \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathrm{MBZ}} 2\mathrm{i}\sin(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R})\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \ , \\ t(\mathbf{R}\in B) &= \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathrm{MBZ}} 2\cos(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R})\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

However, in a solid in the absence of spin-orbit coupling, the tunnel amplitudes for electrons are real so that particle-hole symmetry actually implies $t(\mathbf{R} \in A) \equiv 0$. In our conceptual study we do not impose this constraint.

We demand that the transfer element t_{12} in eq. (6) has the same properties as $t(\mathbf{R})$. Therefore, we assume t_{12} to be imaginary when $\mathbf{R}_1$ and $\mathbf{R}_2$ are on the same sublattice, and real when they are on different sublattices. This can be cast into the relation

$$t_{12}^* = -t_{12}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot(\mathbf{R}_1-\mathbf{R}_2)} \ . \tag{60}$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha_{12}^2 = -e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{R}_1-\mathbf{R}_2)} \tag{61}$$

in eq. (10).

Lastly, we demand that

$$V_{\mathbf{k}} = V_{\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{k}}^* \ . \tag{62}$$

Note that a purely local hybridization, $V_{\mathbf{k}} \equiv V$, must necessarily be real. We impose the conditions (57), (60), and (62) to make the Hamiltonian invariant under particle-hole transformation.

4.2 Particle-hole transformation We employ

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathrm{ph}} \ : \hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} &\mapsto \hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+ = \hat{c}_{\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{k},\sigma}^+ \ , \\ \hat{d}_{b,\sigma} &\mapsto \hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}\hat{d}_{b,\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+ = -e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_b}\hat{d}_{b,\sigma}^+ \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

as particle-hole transformation so that $\hat{n}_{b,\sigma} \mapsto 1 - \hat{n}_{b,\sigma}$. The unitary operator $\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}$ that generates the particle-hole transformation is provided in appendix A.

Using eqs. (60) and (63) it is readily shown that $\hat{T}_d$ and $\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}$ are particle-hole symmetric, i.e., $\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}\hat{T}_d\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+ = \hat{T}_d$ and $\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}\hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+ = \hat{H}_{\mathrm{int}}$. Moreover, eqs. (57) and (63) ensure that $\hat{T}$ maps onto itself under τ_{ph}. Lastly, the hybridization $\hat{V}$ is seen to be invariant when we use eqs. (62) and (63). Therefore, the particle-hole transformation maps $\hat{H}$ onto itself,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}\hat{H}\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+ = \hat{H} \ . \tag{64}$$

The operator for the total particle number is given by

$$\hat{N} = \sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^+\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} + \sum_{b,\sigma}\hat{n}_{b,\sigma} \ . \tag{65}$$

Under the particle-hole transformation τ_{ph} it transforms as

$$\tau_{\mathrm{ph}} \ : \hat{N} \mapsto 2L + 4 - \hat{N} \ . \tag{66}$$

Therefore, the particle-hole transformation τ_{ph} maps systems at and above half filling to those at and below half filling, and vice versa.

4.3 Half-filled bands In the following we consider paramagnetic bands at half filling where the number of electrons $N = N_\uparrow + N_\downarrow$ equals the (even) number of orbitals, $N = L + 2$, and $N_\uparrow = N_\downarrow = L/2 + 1$. Note that there are L lattices sites for the host electrons and two additional impurity orbitals on the lattice sites $\mathbf{R}_1$ and $\mathbf{R}_2$.

At half band-filling, the non-degenerate ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ maps onto itself under the particle-hole transformation, $\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Psi_0\rangle$. Therefore, we find

$$\langle\Psi_0|\hat{n}_{b\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle = \langle\Psi_0|\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}\hat{n}_{b,\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}}^+|\Psi_0\rangle = 1 - \langle\Psi_0|\hat{n}_{b\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle \ , \tag{67}$$

i.e., each impurity level is exactly half filled for all hybridizations and interaction strengths,

$$\langle\Psi_0|\hat{n}_{b\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle = 1/2 \ . \tag{68}$$

Moreover, it is readily shown that the bare density of states is symmetric,

$$D_{\sigma,0}(\epsilon) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}}\delta(\epsilon - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})) = D_{\sigma,0}(-\epsilon) \ , \tag{69}$$

so that the Fermi energy is at $E_{\mathrm{F}} = 0$ at half band-filling.

When the Hamiltonian is expressed in the h-basis, we note that

$$\langle\Psi_0|\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}^+\hat{h}_{1,\sigma} + \hat{h}_{2,\sigma}^+\hat{h}_{2,\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle = 1 \tag{70}$$

at half band-filling. Moreover, the particle-hole transformation implies

$$\tau_{\mathrm{ph}} \ : \hat{h}_{b,\sigma} \mapsto e^{-\mathrm{i}\gamma_{12}}\hat{h}_{\bar{b},\sigma}^+ \ , \ e^{-\mathrm{i}\gamma_{12}} = -\alpha_{12}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_1} \ , \tag{71}$$

where we used the notation $\bar{1} = 2$, $\bar{2} = 1$. Therefore, particle-hole symmetry at half band-filling leads to

$$\langle\Psi_0|\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}^+\hat{h}_{2,\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle = \langle\Psi_0|\hat{h}_{2,\sigma}\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}^+|\Psi_0\rangle \ , \tag{72}$$

so that there is no hybridization between the h-orbitals at half band-filling,

$$\langle\Psi_0|\hat{h}_{1,\sigma}^+\hat{h}_{2,\sigma}|\Psi_0\rangle = 0 \ . \tag{73}$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

Note that, for $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{R}_2$, we have $\alpha_{11}^2 = -1$ so that $V_{\mathbf{k},1} = V_{\mathbf{k},2} \neq 0$ in eq. (14). Even in this case, both impurity levels couple to the bath electrons and the separation between 'odd' and 'even' channels does not lead to an inert impurity level as in [13].

5 Tight-binding model with local hybridization

To arrive at definite results, we consider spin-1/2 host electrons that move between nearest neighbors on a three-dimensional simple-cubic lattice. Moreover, we assume that the hybridization between host levels and impurity levels and the direct transfer between the impurities are weak (RKKY limit). In this limit we provide explicit expressions for the ground-state energy, impurity density, and impurity contribution to the spectral function.

5.1 Model setup First, we specify the dispersion relation of the host electrons and the hybridization matrix elements and calculate the host-electron density-density correlation function. We work out the host Green functions and hybridization functions under the assumption that the hybridization is weak and purely local.

5.1.1 Host electron dispersion relation and hybridization The dispersion relation is given by

$$\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = -\frac{W}{6}\big(\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y) + \cos(k_z)\big) \ , \qquad (74)$$

where we set the lattice spacing to unity, $a \equiv 1$. Henceforth we use the bandwidth as our energy unit, $W \equiv 1$. The nesting vector is $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi, \pi)$, $\epsilon(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{k}) = -\epsilon(\mathbf{k})$.

We place the first impurity onto the origin of the A-lattice, $\mathbf{R}_1 = \mathbf{0}$, and write $\mathbf{R}_2 \equiv \mathbf{R}$ for simplicity. Then, we have ($\alpha_{12} \equiv \alpha_{\mathbf{R}}$)

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}^2 = -\exp(-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}) = (-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z)+1} \ . \qquad (75)$$

We use a purely local hybridization $V_{\mathbf{k}} = V$ so that

$$V_{\mathbf{k},1} = \frac{V}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - \alpha_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \ , \ V_{\mathbf{k},2} = \frac{V}{\sqrt{2}}(\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}^* + e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \ . \qquad (76)$$

5.1.2 Host electron density-density correlation function Since the RKKY interaction between the impurities is mediated by the host electrons it is instructive to study the density-density correlation function in the host electrons' Fermi sea. The correlation function between like spins and $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is given by ($\hat{n}_{c,\mathbf{R},\sigma} = \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{R},\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma}$)

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\mathrm{nn}}_{\uparrow}(\mathbf{R}) &= \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{R}'} \langle \mathrm{FS}|\hat{n}_{c,\mathbf{R}',\uparrow}\hat{n}_{c,\mathbf{R}'+\mathbf{R},\uparrow}|\mathrm{FS}\rangle - n_{\uparrow}^2 \\ &= -\left|\frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} n^{\mathrm{FS}}_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}\right|^2 \ , \end{aligned} \qquad (77)$$

where $n_{\uparrow} = 1/2$ and $n^{\mathrm{FS}}_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow} = 1 - \Theta[\epsilon(k)]$ is unity in the reduced Brillouin zone. For $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice we have $\exp(\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}) = 1$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} n^{\mathrm{FS}}_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow} &= \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\epsilon \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})) e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\epsilon \frac{1}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \big[\delta(\epsilon - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})) e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \\ &\qquad + \delta(\epsilon + \epsilon(\mathbf{k})) e^{\mathrm{i}(\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{k})\cdot\mathbf{R}}\big] \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\epsilon \frac{1}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})) e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\mathbf{R},\mathbf{0}} = 0 \end{aligned} \qquad (78)$$

because $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Since the host electrons mediate the RKKY interaction but do not show any non-trivial correlations for $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice, the RKKY coupling does not lead to a level splitting, as shown in section 5.3.2.

5.1.3 Host-electron Green functions First, we define two distance-dependent density of states $D_{A,B}(\omega;\mathbf{R})$ and their Hilbert-transformed $\Lambda_{A,B}(\omega;\mathbf{R})$ that naturally appear in the hybridization functions, see section 5.1.4. To this end, we first consider

$$\begin{aligned} D_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{\delta(\omega - \epsilon(\mathbf{k}))}{2L}(e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} + e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \ , \\ \Lambda_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \fint_{-1/2}^{1/2} \mathrm{d}\omega' \frac{D_A(\omega';\mathbf{R})}{\omega - \omega'} \ . \end{aligned} \qquad (79)$$

These quantities are the real and imaginary parts of the complex functions

$$\begin{aligned} H_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \Lambda_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) - \mathrm{i}\pi D_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{(e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} + e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})}{\omega - \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) + \mathrm{i}\eta} \ . \end{aligned} \qquad (80)$$

This relation shows that $H_{A;\mathbf{R}}(\omega;\mathbf{R})$ is finite only if $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice. For this reason, we added the redundant index A. For our dispersion (74) we have from the Fourier transformation

$$\begin{aligned} H_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= (-\mathrm{i})\int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{d}t e^{\mathrm{i}(\omega+\mathrm{i}\eta)t} \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\epsilon(\mathbf{k})t}\left(e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}} + e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}\right) \\ &= \delta_{\mathbf{R}\in A}(-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z)/2}(-\mathrm{i}) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{d}t e^{\mathrm{i}\omega t} J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big) J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big) J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big) \ , \end{aligned} \qquad (81)$$

where the first factor implies that $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice, i.e., $R_x + R_y + R_z$ must be an even integer. Here, $J_n(x) = (-1)^n J_n(-x)$ is the Bessel function of integer order n.

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

Consequently, we have from the real and imaginary parts

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \delta_{\mathbf{R}\in A}(-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z)/2} \\ &\quad\times\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t\,\sin(\omega t)J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big), \\ D_A(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \delta_{\mathbf{R}\in A}(-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z)/2} \\ &\quad\times\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\pi}\,\cos(\omega t)J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

for $\mathbf{R}\in A$-lattice. For later use we denote $D_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega) = D_A(\omega;\mathbf{0})$ and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)=\Lambda_A(\omega;\mathbf{0})$.

Next, we define

$$\begin{aligned}D_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}}\frac{\delta(\omega-\epsilon(\mathbf{k}))}{2L}(\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})\,, \\ \Lambda_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \fint_{-1/2}^{1/2}\mathrm{d}\omega'\frac{D_B(\omega';\mathbf{R})}{\omega-\omega'}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

These quantities are the real and imaginary parts of the complex functions

$$\begin{aligned}H_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \Lambda_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})-\mathrm{i}\pi D_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}}{\omega-\epsilon(\mathbf{k})+\mathrm{i}\eta}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Since $\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}=-\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}$ for $\mathbf{R}\in A$-lattice, $H_{B;\mathbf{R}}(\omega;\mathbf{R})$ is finite only if $\mathbf{R}\in B$-lattice. Again, we indicate this by the redundant index B.

For our dispersion (74) we have from the Fourier transformation

$$\begin{aligned}H_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= (-\mathrm{i})\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t e^{\mathrm{i}(\omega+\mathrm{i}\eta)t} \\ &\quad\times\frac{1}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\epsilon(\mathbf{k})t}\left(\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}\right) \\ &= \delta_{\mathbf{R}\in B}(-\mathrm{i})\mathrm{i}^{R_x+R_y+R_z} \\ &\quad\times\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t e^{\mathrm{i}\omega t}J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where the first factor implies that $\mathbf{R}\in B$-lattice, i.e., $R_x+R_y+R_z$ must be an odd integer. Consequently, we have from the real and imaginary parts

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \delta_{\mathbf{R}\in B}(-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z+3)/2} \\ &\quad\times\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t\,\cos(\omega t)J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big), \\ D_B(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \delta_{\mathbf{R}\in B}(-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z+1)/2} \\ &\quad\times\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\pi}\,\sin(\omega t)J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

for $\mathbf{R}\in B$-lattice.

5.1.4 Hybridization functions We have

$$\begin{aligned}V_{\mathbf{k},1}V^*_{\mathbf{k},1} &= \frac{V^2}{2}(1-\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})(1-\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \\ &= V^2(1-\frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}}{2}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}-\frac{\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}}{2}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Thus, we obtain from eqs. (30) and (76)

$$\begin{aligned}H_{1,1}(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= \frac{V^2}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\frac{1}{\omega-\epsilon(\mathbf{k})+\mathrm{i}\eta} \\ &\quad-\frac{V^2}{2L}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}}{\omega-\epsilon(\mathbf{k})+\mathrm{i}\eta} \\ &= V^2\big(\Lambda_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)-\Lambda_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})\big) \\ &\quad-\mathrm{i}\pi V^2\big(D_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)-D_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})\big)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}V_{\mathbf{k},2}V^*_{\mathbf{k},2} &= \frac{V^2}{2L}(\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}+e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})(\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}+e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \\ &= \frac{V^2}{L}(1+\frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}}{2}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+\frac{\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}}{2}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}H_{2,2}(\omega;\mathbf{R}) &= V^2\big(\Lambda_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)+\Lambda_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})\big) \\ &\quad-\mathrm{i}\pi V^2\big(D_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)+D_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})\big)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}V_{\mathbf{k},1}V^*_{\mathbf{k},2} &= \frac{V^2}{2}(1-\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})(\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}+e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \\ &= \frac{V^2}{2}(e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

Therefore,

$$H_{1,2}(\omega;\mathbf{R}) = V^2\Lambda_A(\omega;\mathbf{R})-\mathrm{i}\pi V^2 D_A(\omega;\mathbf{R})\,, \tag{92}$$

and since

$$\begin{aligned}V_{\mathbf{k},2}V^*_{\mathbf{k},1} &= \frac{V^2}{2}(1-\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})(\alpha^*_{\mathbf{R}}+e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}) \\ &= \frac{V^2}{2}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}(e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}+e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}})\,,\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

we find

$$H_{2,1}(\omega;\mathbf{R}) = H_{1,2}(\omega;\mathbf{R})\,. \tag{94}$$

5.1.5 RKKY limit of small hybridization For $V\ll 1$ and $|t_{12}|\ll 1$, the relevant frequency range for the occupation densities and the hybridization will turn out to be also small, $|\omega|\ll 1$. Therefore, we keep only the leading-order terms in $D_{A,B}(\omega;\mathbf{R})$ around $\omega=0$.

For $\omega\to 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}D_{A;\mathbf{R}}(\omega\to 0) &= s_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}\,, \\ d_{\mathbf{R}} &= \int_0^\infty\frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\pi}J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)\,, \\ s_{\mathbf{R}} &= (-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z)/2}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

and

$$\Lambda_A(\omega\to 0;\mathbf{R}) = \omega s_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}} ,$$
$$\ell_{\mathbf{R}} = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}t\, t J_{R_x}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_y}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big)J_{R_z}\Big(\frac{t}{6}\Big) , \tag{96}$$

where it is implicitly understood that $R_x+R_y+R_z$ must be an even integer. The integrals for $d_{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\ell_{\mathbf{R}}$ can be calculated numerically with MATHEMATICA [14].

Moreover, for $\omega\to 0$ we have

$$D_B(\omega\to 0;\mathbf{R}) = \tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\frac{\omega}{\pi}\ell_{\mathbf{R}} , \tag{97}$$
$$\Lambda_{B;\mathbf{R}}(\omega\to 0) = -\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} ,$$
$$\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}} = (-1)^{(R_x+R_y+R_z+1)/2} , \tag{98}$$

where it is implicitly understood that $R_x+R_y+R_z$ must be an odd integer.

5.2 Particle density We recall that the first impurity is at the origin that belongs to sublattice A by definition, and the second impurity lies at $\mathbf{R}$. We treat the two cases, $\mathbf{R}\in A/B$-lattice separately; it is implicitly understood in the following that $\mathbf{R}$ lies in the corresponding sublattice.

5.2.1 $\mathbf{R}\in B$-lattice We start with the simpler of the two cases. We use $D_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)\approx d_{\mathbf{0}}$, $\Lambda_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)\approx\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}}$, and $D_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})\approx(\omega/\pi)\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}$, $\Lambda_B(\omega;\mathbf{R})\approx-\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{1,1}(\omega) &\approx V^2(\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}}+\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}) - \mathrm{i}V^2(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}-\omega\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}) ,\\
H_{2,2}(\omega) &\approx V^2(\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}}-\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}) - \mathrm{i}V^2(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}+\omega\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}) ,\\
H_{1,2}(\omega) &= 0 ,\\
H_{2,1}(\omega) &= 0 .
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Since the mixing terms vanish, we can considerably simplify $n_{1,\uparrow}$ to

$$\begin{aligned}
n_{1,\uparrow} &= -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-1/2}^0 \mathrm{d}\omega \mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{1}{\omega+|t_{12}|-H_{1,1}(\omega)}\right]\\
&\approx \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-C}^0 \mathrm{d}\omega \frac{V^2(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}-\omega\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}})}{P_B(\omega)}
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
P_B(\omega) &= [\omega+|t_{12}|-V^2(\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}}+\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})]^2\\
&\quad +[V^2(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}-\omega\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}})]^2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

where $C>0$ is of order unity. Corrections are small, of order V^2. For $|t_{12}|, V\to 0$ it is useful to set

$$\omega = V^2 x \quad , \quad |t_{12}| = V^2\bar{t} \quad , \quad C/V^2\to\infty . \tag{102}$$

Ignoring terms of order V^2 and higher, we arrive at

$$n_{1,\uparrow} \approx d_{\mathbf{0}}\int_{-\infty}^0 \mathrm{d}x[\tilde{P}_B(x)]^{-1} \tag{103}$$

with

$$\tilde{P}_B(x) = x^2+2x(\bar{t}-\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})+(\bar{t}-\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2+(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2 . \tag{104}$$

The integral is elementary and gives

$$n_{1,\uparrow} \approx \frac{1}{\pi}\left[\arctan\left(\frac{\bar{t}-\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right)+\frac{\pi}{2}\right] . \tag{105}$$

For an impurity coupling $|t_{12}|$ of order unity, the large value for $\bar{t}=|t_{12}|/V^2$ leads to $n_{1,\uparrow}\approx 1$, irrespective of $\mathbf{R}$. For this reason, it is important to have a small direct coupling of the impurities, $|t_{12}|=\mathcal{O}(V^2)$, to obtain a RKKY behavior, see sections 5.5 and 5.6.

5.2.2 $\mathbf{R}\in A$-lattice We use $D_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)\approx d_{\mathbf{0}}$, $\Lambda_{\mathbf{0}}(\omega)\approx\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}}$, and $D_A(\omega;\mathbf{R})\approx s_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}$, $\Lambda_A(\omega;\mathbf{R})\approx\omega s_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}$ to find

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{1,1}(\omega) &\approx V^2\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}} - \mathrm{i}\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}} ,\\
H_{2,2}(\omega) &= H_{1,1}(\omega) ,\\
H_{1,2}(\omega) &\approx V^2\omega s_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}} - \mathrm{i}\pi V^2 s_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} ,\\
H_{2,1}(\omega) &= H_{1,2}(\omega) .
\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\omega) &\approx (\omega - V^2\omega\ell_{\mathbf{0}}+\mathrm{i}\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}})^2 - |t_{12}|^2\\
&\quad -[H_{1,2}(\omega)]^2 ,\\
\mathrm{Re}[\Delta(\omega)] &= \omega^2(1-V^2\ell_{\mathbf{0}})^2 - (\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}})^2 - |t_{12}|^2\\
&\quad +(\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 - (V^2\omega\ell_{\mathbf{R}})^2 ,\\
\mathrm{Im}[\Delta(\omega)] &= 2\pi\omega V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}(1-V^2\ell_{\mathbf{0}}) + 2\pi\omega V^4\ell_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} .
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

The density simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
n_{1,\uparrow} &\approx -\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-C}^0 \mathrm{d}\omega\left[\frac{\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}\mathrm{Re}[\Delta(\omega)]}{P_A(\omega)}\right.\\
&\quad \left. -\frac{(\omega(1-V^2\ell_{\mathbf{0}})-|t_{12}|)\mathrm{Im}[\Delta(\omega)]}{J_A(\omega)}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

with

$$J_A(\omega) = (\mathrm{Re}[\Delta(\omega)])^2 + (\mathrm{Im}[\Delta(\omega)])^2 \tag{109}$$

and a high-energy cut-off, $C=\mathcal{O}(1)$. For $|t_{12}|, V\to 0$ we use eq. (102) and neglect higher-order terms like $V^2\omega\ll V^2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}[\Delta(x)] &= V^4\left[x^2-\bar{t}^2+(\pi d_{\mathbf{R}})^2-(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2\right] ,\\
\mathrm{Im}[\Delta(x)] &= 2\pi x V^4 d_{\mathbf{0}} .
\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

The particle density becomes formally independent of V^2 and reads

$$n_{1,\uparrow} \approx d_{\mathbf{0}}\int_{-\infty}^0 \mathrm{d}x\frac{x^2+\bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})-2x\bar{t}}{(x^2-\bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}}))^2+(2\pi x d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \tag{111}$$

with

$$p_{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{\pi^2(d_{\mathbf{0}}^2-d_{\mathbf{R}}^2)}{\bar{t}^2} > 0 . \tag{112}$$

We split the integral into even and odd terms, and substitute $y=x/\bar{t}$ in the integral over even powers and $\lambda=x^2/\bar{t}^2$ in

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

the integral over odd powers,

$$n_{1,\uparrow} = \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{2\bar{t}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(y^2 + (1+p_{\mathbf{R}}))\mathrm{d}y}{y^4 - 2y^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}}) + (1+p_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + y^2\kappa^2} + \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{\bar{t}} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{\lambda^2 + \lambda(\kappa^2 - 2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})) + (1+p_{\mathbf{R}})^2} \tag{113}$$

with $\kappa = 2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}/\bar{t}$. The first term integrates to 1/2. The second term is elementary. We define

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{1+p_{\mathbf{R}}}} = \frac{2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}}{\sqrt{\bar{t}^2 + \pi^2(d_{\mathbf{0}}^2 - d_{\mathbf{R}}^2)}} \tag{114}$$

and find with the substitution $\lambda = (1+p_{\mathbf{R}})\mu$

$$n_{1,\uparrow} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\kappa}{2\pi(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})} \int_0^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\mu \frac{1}{\mu^2 + \mu(\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2 - 2) + 1} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1+p_{\mathbf{R}}}} G(\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}) \,, \tag{115}$$

where $G(0 < x < 2) \equiv G_1(x)$ and $G(x \geq 2) \equiv G_2(x)$ with

$$G_1(x) = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{4-x^2}} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{4-x^2}} \arctan\left(\frac{x^2-2}{x\sqrt{4-x^2}}\right) \,,$$
$$G_2(x) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2-4}} \ln\left(\frac{x^2 - 2 - x\sqrt{x^2-4}}{x^2 - 2 + x\sqrt{x^2-4}}\right) \,. \tag{116}$$

5.3 Impurity contribution to the density of states In the RKKY limit, $|t_{12}|, V \ll 1$, we can find an explicit expression for the impurity-contribution to the density of states. Again, we treat the two cases, $\mathbf{R} \in A/B$-lattice separately.

5.3.1 $\mathbf{R} \in B$-lattice Now that we have $H_{1,2} = H_{2,1} = 0$, $H_{1,1}(\omega) = V^2\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} - \mathrm{i}V^2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}$, $H_{2,2}(\omega) = -V^2\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} - \mathrm{i}V^2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}$, $H'_{1,1}(\omega) = V^2\ell_{\mathbf{0}} + \mathrm{i}V^2\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}$, and $H'_{2,2}(\omega) = V^2\ell_{\mathbf{0}} - \mathrm{i}V^2\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}$, we find

$$V^2 D_{1,\sigma}(x) = \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{(x + \bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \,,$$
$$V^2 D_{2,\sigma}(x) = \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{(x - \bar{t} + \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \tag{117}$$

after scaling with V^2. The contribution of the two impurities is given by two Lorentz-peaks at $x = \pm(\bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})$ with $\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}$ as half-width at half maximum.

Due to the hybridization with the host electrons, we find the contribution

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta D_{\sigma}^{\mathrm{host}}(x) &= \mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{V^2(\ell_{\mathbf{0}} + \mathrm{i}\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}})/\pi}{\omega + |t_{12}| - V^2\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} + \mathrm{i}\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right] \\ &\quad + \mathrm{Im}\left[\frac{V^2(\ell_{\mathbf{0}} - \mathrm{i}\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}})/\pi}{\omega - |t_{12}| + V^2\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}} + \mathrm{i}\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right] \\ &= \frac{\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}(x + \bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})/\pi - d_{\mathbf{0}}\ell_{\mathbf{0}}}{(x + \bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}(x - \bar{t} + \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})/\pi + d_{\mathbf{0}}\ell_{\mathbf{0}}}{(x - \bar{t} + \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \,.\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

Apparently, the host contribution is of order V^2 smaller than the two Lorentzian peaks in eq. (117) and can be ignored for small V. Note that $\Delta D_{\sigma}^{\mathrm{host}}(|x| \gg 1) \sim 1/x^2$ because the terms proportional to $(x/\pi)\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}\ell_{\mathbf{R}}$ cancel each other for large $|x|$.

5.3.2 $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice Likewise, $\Delta D_{\sigma}^{\mathrm{host}}(\omega)$ is much smaller than the contributions $D_b(\omega)$ to the impurity density of states. We find as dominant terms

$$V^2 D_{1,\sigma}(x) = d_{\mathbf{0}} \frac{x^2 - 2x\bar{t} + \bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})}{[x^2 - \bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})]^2 + (2\pi x d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \,,$$
$$V^2 D_{2,\sigma}(x) = d_{\mathbf{0}} \frac{x^2 + 2x\bar{t} + \bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})}{[x^2 - \bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}})]^2 + (2\pi x d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \tag{119}$$

after scaling with V^2 and with $p_{\mathbf{R}}$ from eq. (112).

5.4 Ground-state energy Accordingly, the ground-state energy simplifies in the RKKY limit, and we find explicit expressions to order $\mathcal{O}(V^2\ln(V^2), V^2)$.

5.4.1 $\mathbf{R} \in B$-lattice Since the contribution from $\Delta D_{\sigma}^{\mathrm{host}}(\omega)$ are a factor V^2 smaller than those from $D_b(\omega)$, we have to order $V^2\ln(V^2)$ and V^2

$$\Delta E_0 = 2|t_{12}| + \Delta\tilde{E}_0 \,,$$
$$\Delta\tilde{E}_0 \approx 2\int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\omega \sum_b \omega D_b(\omega) \,. \tag{120}$$

With the expressions (117) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\tilde{E}_0 &\approx 2d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2 \int_{-C/V^2}^{0} \mathrm{d}x \frac{x + \bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{(x + \bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \\ &\quad + 2d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2 \int_{-C/V^2}^{0} \mathrm{d}x \frac{x - \bar{t} + \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{(x - \bar{t} + \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \\ &\quad - 2d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2 \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}x \frac{\bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{(x + \bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \\ &\quad + 2d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2 \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}x \frac{\bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{(x - \bar{t} + \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \\ &= 4V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}} \ln\left(\frac{V^2}{C}\right) \\ &\quad + 2V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}} \ln\left[(\bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}})^2 + (\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2\right] \\ &\quad - 4V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}} \frac{\bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}} \arctan\left(\frac{\bar{t} - \pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}}d_{\mathbf{R}}}{\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

with $C = \mathcal{O}(1)$. With the help of eq. (105) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\tilde{E}_0 &= 4d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2 \ln\left(\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}/C\right) \\ &\quad - 4d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2 \ln\left[\cos(\pi/2 - n_{1,\uparrow}\pi)\right] \\ &\quad - 4d_{\mathbf{0}}V^2(\pi/2 - n_{1,\uparrow}\pi)\tan\left(\pi/2 - n_{1,\uparrow}\pi\right) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(V^4\ln(V^2)\right) \,.\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

5.4.2 $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice We have to leading order

$$\Delta\tilde{E}_0 \approx 2V^2 \int_{-C/V^2}^{0} \mathrm{d}x \sum_b x V^2 D_b(x) \,. \tag{123}$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

Using the expressions (119) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Delta\tilde{E}_0}{V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}} &= 4\int_{-C/V^2}^{0} \mathrm{d}x \frac{x(x^2+\bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}}))}{(x^2-\bar{t}^2(1+p_{\mathbf{R}}))^2+(2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2 x^2} \\ &= 4\int_{-C/(V^2\bar{t}\sqrt{1+p_{\mathbf{R}}})}^{0} \mathrm{d}y \frac{y(y^2+1)}{(y^2-1)^2+\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2 y^2} \\ &= -\int_0^{C^2/(V^2\bar{t}\sqrt{1+p_{\mathbf{R}}})^2} \mathrm{d}\lambda \frac{2\lambda-2+\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2+4-\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2}{\lambda^2-2\lambda+1+\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2\lambda} \\ &= -\ln\left[\lambda^2-2\lambda+1+\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2\lambda\right]_0^{C^2/(V^2\bar{t}\sqrt{1+p_{\mathbf{R}}})^2} \\ &\quad -\frac{(4-\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2)}{\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}} G(\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}) \\ &= -\left[4\ln\left(\frac{C\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}}{2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2}\right)+\frac{(4-\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}^2)}{\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}} G(\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}})\right] \quad (124)\end{aligned}$$

with $p_{\mathbf{R}}$ from eq. (112) and $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}}$ from eq. (114), and we used eq. (115) in the third step.

5.5 Level splitting via the RKKY interaction In the absence of an electron transfer between the impurity sites, $t_{12}=0$, the effective level splitting is not necessarily zero.

5.5.1 $\mathbf{R} \in$ B-lattice From eq. (117) we see that the impurity contribution to the density of states is dominantly given by two Lorentz peaks at $\omega_\pm = \pm V^2 \pi d_{\mathbf{R}}$ with $\pi d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2$ as half-width at half maximum,

$$\begin{aligned}V^2 D_{1,\sigma}(x) &= \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{(x-\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}} d_{\mathbf{R}})^2+(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2}\ , \\ V^2 D_{2,\sigma}(x) &= \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{(x+\pi\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}} d_{\mathbf{R}})^2+(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}})^2}\ . \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

Moreover, the particle density in the level $b=1$ is $n_{1,\uparrow} \approx 1/2 - \tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}} d_{\mathbf{R}}/(\pi d_{\mathbf{0}}) \neq 1/2$.

5.5.2 $\mathbf{R} \in$ A-lattice For the A-lattice, the situation is different. We have $D_{1,\sigma}(\omega) = D_{2,\sigma}(\omega)$ and find a single peak at $\omega = 0$. In particular, for $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{0}$ we observe a Lorentz peak at $\omega = 0$ with half width at half maximum of $2\pi d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2$. For $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{0}$ we have

$$V^2 D_{b,\sigma}(x) = \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}}{\beta_{\mathbf{R}}^2} \frac{(x/\beta_{\mathbf{R}})^2+1}{[(x/\beta_{\mathbf{R}})^2-1]^2+4\gamma_{\mathbf{R}}^2 (x/\beta_{\mathbf{R}})^2} \quad (126)$$

with

$$\beta_{\mathbf{R}}^2 = \pi^2(d_{\mathbf{0}}^2 - d_{\mathbf{R}}^2)\ ,\ \gamma_{\mathbf{R}}^2 = \frac{d_{\mathbf{0}}^2}{d_{\mathbf{0}}^2 - d_{\mathbf{R}}^2}\ . \quad (127)$$

In general, $D_b(x)$ is almost a Lorentz peak at $x=0$ with half width half maximum $\beta_{\mathbf{R}}$ because $\gamma_{\mathbf{R}} \approx 1$ for all $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Apparently, the RKKY splitting is absent for $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice. We only have a single peak in the density of state for $t_{12}=0$ and, correspondingly, eq. (115) gives $n_{1,\uparrow} = 1/2$. In Fig. 1 we show the density of states for two impurities at nearest-neighbor positions in the simple-cubic lattice, $\mathbf{R} = (1,0,0) \in B$-lattice, and at next-nearest-neighbor positions, $\mathbf{R} = (2,0,0) \in A$-lattice.



Figure 1 Impurity density of states, eqs. (125) and (126), as a function of frequency $x = \omega/V^2$ for two impurities at nearest-neighbor distance $\mathbf{R} = (1,0,0) \in B$-lattice (full lines) and next-nearest-neighbor distance $\mathbf{R} = (2,0,0) \in A$-lattice (dashed line) for $\bar{t} = 0$. Numerically, $d_{\mathbf{0}} = 1.712$, $\pi d_{(1,0,0)} = 2$, $\tilde{s}_{(1,0,0)} = -1$, and $d_{(2,0,0)} = 0.2928$ so that $\beta^2_{(2,0,0)} = 28.08$ and $\gamma^2_{(2,0,0)} = 1.03$.

Note that, for the parameters chosen, the respective sums $\sum_b D_{b,\sigma}(\omega)$ are almost indistinguishable. Therefore, it is difficult to resolve the two-peak structure for $U=0$. For finite U, and for $U \gg 1$ in particular, the peaks narrow into two well-separated, sharp Kondo resonances whose splitting can be detected more easily.

5.6 RKKY energy Lastly, we discuss the contribution of the two-impurity interaction to the ground-state energy for $t_{12}=0$ and $V \ll 1$.

5.6.1 $\mathbf{R} \in$ B-lattice The level splitting results in a decrease in energy. From eq. (122) we see that for $y = n_{1,\uparrow}\pi - \pi/2$ and with $\Delta E_0 = \Delta\tilde{E}_0$ for $t_{12}=0$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_0 &= 4 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \ln\left(\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}/C\right) \\ &\quad -4 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \left[\ln\left(\cos(y)\right) + y\tan(y)\right]\ . \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

As seen from eq. (105), the absolute value of $\tan(y) = -\tilde{s}_{\mathbf{R}} d_{\mathbf{R}}/d_{\mathbf{0}}$ is small so that

$$\Delta E_0 \approx 4 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \ln\left(\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}/C\right) - 2 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \left(\frac{d_{\mathbf{R}}}{d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right)^2\ . \quad (129)$$

The first term originates from the host electron scattering off the individual impurities, the second term reflects the energy gain by the coherent scattering off both impurity levels. Therefore, the RKKY energy of the two impurities is given by

$$E_{\mathrm{RKKY}}(\mathbf{R} \in B\text{-lattice}) = -2 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \left(\frac{d_{\mathbf{R}}}{d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right)^2\ . \quad (130)$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher



Figure 2 RKKY energy, eqs. (130) and (132), as a function of the impurity separation R along the axis directions $< R, 0, 0 >$ (top) and along the diagonal direction $[R, R, R]$ (bottom).

The RKKY interaction always leads to a *decrease* in energy when $\mathbf{R} \in B$-lattice. We show the RKKY energy in Fig. 2.

5.6.2 $\mathbf{R} \in$ *A*-lattice The impurity levels are not split when $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice. Nevertheless, the coherent scattering off the two impurities changes the ground-state energy. With $\tilde{\kappa}_{\mathbf{R}} = 2/\sqrt{1-(d_{\mathbf{R}}/d_{\mathbf{0}})^2} \gtrsim 2$ we obtain from eq. (124)

$$\Delta E_0 \approx 4 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \ln(\pi V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}}/C) + 2V^2 d_{\mathbf{0}} \left(\frac{d_{\mathbf{R}}}{d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right)^2 . \quad (131)$$

The functional dependence on $\mathbf{R}$ is the same as in (130),

$$E_{\rm RKKY}(\mathbf{R} \in A\text{-lattice}) = 2 d_{\mathbf{0}} V^2 \left(\frac{d_{\mathbf{R}}}{d_{\mathbf{0}}}\right)^2 , \quad (132)$$

but for $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice the RKKY interaction always leads to an *increase* in energy, see Fig. 2. The functional form of the RKKY energy can also be obtained from the RKKY exchange interaction, as we show in appendix C.

6 Conclusions In this work we studied the non-interacting two-impurity Anderson model on a lattice. We calculated the single-particle Green functions analytically using the equation-of-motion method. We focused on the particle-hole symmetric case at half band-filling for host electrons with nearest-neighbor electron transfer on a simple-cubic (bipartite) lattice. For a local, weak hybridization between impurities and host electrons and no direct coupling between the impurities (RKKY limit), we provide explicit analytic formulae for the impurity density of states and the ground-state energy contribution due to the presence of the impurities.

In general, the RKKY interaction leads to an effective coupling between the impurities so that the single-particle density of states displays two peaks. For the non-interacting Anderson model, the level splitting is small and decays as a function of the impurity distance. However, even for short distances, two peaks are difficult to resolve in the total density of states. The splitting exactly vanishes only if the host electrons' density-density correlation function is zero, as is the case when both impurities are on the same sublattice, due to particle-hole symmetry at half band-filling.

The analytic formulae for the RKKY interaction in the non-interacting two-impurity Anderson model differ even to second-order perturbation theory in the hybridization because the exact solution contains all multiple scatterings between impurities and host electrons. Nevertheless, the perturbative approach is able to account for the distance-dependence qualitatively because it reproduces the alternating sign between the two sublattices. In general, however, the multiple scattering contributions modify the exchange interaction quantitatively for a dense host-electron system, namely in its size and distance-dependence.

The two-impurity Anderson model at $U = 0$ contains the RKKY indirect exchange mechanism but it does not capture the local-moment formation on the impurity sites that is present in the Kondo limit of half band-filling and large interaction strengths, $U \gg W$. However, the competition of Kondo and RKKY physics can be studied variationally using the Gutzwiller approach that starts from a single-particle product state. Therefore, the present formulae are an indispensable prerequisite for the analytic evaluation of Gutzwiller-correlated wave functions. Work in this direction is in progress [12].

Acknowledgements Z.M.M. Mahmoud thanks the Fachbereich Physik at the Philipps Universität Marburg for its hospitality.

A Particle-hole transformation In this appendix we derive the unitary operator that generates the particle-hole transformation $\tau_{\rm ph}$ in eq. (63). For the host electrons we use $\hat{\tau}_{c;\sigma} = \prod_{\mathbf{R}} \hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma}$, where

$$\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma} = -\hat{c}^{+}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} + e^{-{\rm i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} \quad (133)$$

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

acts only on site $\mathbf{R}$ of the lattice. We have $\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma}\hat{\tau}^+_{\mathbf{R};\sigma} = \mathbb{1}$ and

$$\hat{\tau}^+_{\mathbf{R};\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}\hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} \; . \tag{134}$$

Note that the operators $\hat{\tau}^{(+)}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma}$ and $\hat{\tau}^{(+)}_{\mathbf{R}';\sigma}$ anti-commute with each other and with $\hat{c}^{(+)}_{\mathbf{R}''}$ for $\mathbf{R} \neq \mathbf{R}'$ and $\mathbf{R}'' \neq \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}'$. Consequently, the unitary operator $\hat{\tau}_{c;\sigma}$ generates the particle-hole transformation for the host electrons (L is even),

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}^+_{c;\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{c;\sigma} &= (-1)^{L-1}\sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}\hat{\tau}^+_{\mathbf{R};\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{R},\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{L}}\sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}}\hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{R},\sigma} = \hat{c}^+_{\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{k},\sigma} \; .\end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

Furthermore, for the impurity electrons we set

$$\hat{\tau}_{b;\sigma} = \hat{d}^+_{b,\sigma} + e^{-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_b}\hat{d}_{b,\sigma} \tag{136}$$

with $\hat{\tau}_{b;\sigma}\hat{\tau}^+_{b;\sigma} = \mathbb{1}$ and find

$$\hat{\tau}^+_{2;\sigma}\hat{\tau}^+_{1;\sigma}\hat{d}_{b,\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{1;\sigma}\hat{\tau}_{2;\sigma} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\mathbf{Q}\cdot\mathbf{R}_b}\hat{d}^+_{b,\sigma} \tag{137}$$

because $\hat{\tau}^{(+)}_{2;\sigma}$ and $\hat{\tau}^{(+)}_{1;\sigma}$ anti-commute. The unitary operator for the complete particle-hole transformation reads

$$\hat{\tau}_{\mathrm{ph}} = \prod_{\sigma}\prod_{\mathbf{R}}\hat{\tau}_{\mathbf{R};\sigma}\prod_{b}\hat{\tau}_{b;\sigma} \; . \tag{138}$$

B RKKY interaction at large distances In this appendix we derive the asymptotic formulae applied in Fig. 2.

B.1 Axis direction We must calculate

$$d_{(R,0,0)} = \frac{6}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}x J_R(x)[J_0(x)]^2 \tag{139}$$

for $R \gg 1$. Now that $J_R(x) \sim x^R$ for small x, we can safely use the asymptotic expression for $J_0(x \gg 1)$, number 9.2.1 of [15], to arrive at the approximation

$$d_{(R,0,0)} \approx \frac{6}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}x J_R(x)\frac{2}{\pi x}\cos^2(x-\pi/4) \; . \tag{140}$$

MATHEMATICA [14] gives an analytic result for this integral. Ignoring an exponentially small oscillating term we find

$$d_{(R,0,0)} \approx \frac{6}{\pi^2}\frac{1}{R} \; . \tag{141}$$

As seen from the figure, this approximate formula works very well for all $R \geq 3$.

B.2 Diagonal direction We must calculate for $\mathbf{R} = (R, R, R)$

$$d_{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{6R}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}y [J_R(Ry)]^3 \tag{142}$$

for $R \gg 1$. We use number 9.3.6 together with numbers 9.3.38/39 of [15] to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}d_{\mathbf{R}} \approx{}& \frac{6R}{\pi}\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}y \left(\frac{4\zeta_1(y)}{1-y^2}\right)^{3/4}\left[\mathrm{Ai}\left(R^{2/3}\zeta_1(y)\right)\right]^3 \\ &+\frac{6R}{\pi}\int_1^\infty \mathrm{d}y \left(\frac{4\zeta_2(y)}{1-y^2}\right)^{3/4}\left[\mathrm{Ai}\left(R^{2/3}\zeta_2(y)\right)\right]^3 \; ,\end{aligned} \tag{143}$$

where $\mathrm{Ai}(x)$ is the first Airy function [15] and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2}{3}[\zeta_1(y)]^{3/2} &= \ln\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-y^2}}{y}\right) - \sqrt{1-y^2} \; , \\ \frac{2}{3}[-\zeta_2(y)]^{3/2} &= \sqrt{y^2-1} - \arccos(1/y) \; .\end{aligned} \tag{144}$$

Since $\mathrm{Ai}(|x| \to \infty) = 0$, $\zeta_{1,2}(y)$ must be small. Therefore, $|y-1| \ll 1$ and $\zeta_{1,2} \approx 2^{1/3}(1-y)$. With the approximation $[4\zeta_{1,2}(y)/(1-y^2)]^{3/4} \approx 2$ for the relevant integration region we can simplify

$$\begin{aligned}d_{\mathbf{R}} &\approx \frac{12}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}y \left[\mathrm{Ai}\left(R^{2/3}2^{1/3}(1-y)\right)\right]^3 \\ &\approx R^{-2/3}\frac{12}{\pi}2^{-1/3}\int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathrm{d}\lambda \left[\mathrm{Ai}(\lambda)\right]^3 \; .\end{aligned} \tag{145}$$

With the Fourier representation of the Airy function,

$$\mathrm{Ai}(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{2\pi}e^{\mathrm{i}s\lambda}e^{-\mathrm{i}s^3/3} \; , \tag{146}$$

we find

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathrm{d}\lambda \left[\mathrm{Ai}(\lambda)\right]^3 = \iint_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}s_1}{2\pi}\frac{\mathrm{d}s_2}{2\pi}e^{\mathrm{i}(s_1^3+s_2^3-(s_1+s_2)^3)/3} \; . \tag{147}$$

Using $s_1 = (u+v)/\sqrt{2}$ and $s_2 = (u-v)/\sqrt{2}$ this can be written as

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathrm{d}\lambda \left[\mathrm{Ai}(\lambda)\right]^3 = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}u}{2\pi}e^{\mathrm{i}u^3/\sqrt{2}}\int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\mathrm{d}v}{2\pi}e^{-\mathrm{i}uv^2/\sqrt{2}} \; . \tag{148}$$

The remaining two integrals can be carried out analytically using MATHEMATICA [14] to give

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathrm{d}\lambda \left[\mathrm{Ai}(\lambda)\right]^3 = \frac{2^{1/3}\sqrt{\pi}}{4\sqrt{3}\pi^2}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{6}\right) \; , \tag{149}$$

where $\Gamma(x)$ is the Gamma function. We insert this result into eq. (145) and finally find

$$d_{(R,R,R)} = \sqrt{3}\pi^{-5/2}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)R^{-2/3} \; . \tag{150}$$

The prefactor evaluates to $\sqrt{3}\pi^{-5/2}\Gamma(1/6) \approx 0.55113$.

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

C RKKY exchange interaction Second-order perturbation theory in the impurity-host hybridization gives the RKKY indirect exchange interaction between two spins on a lattice in a metallic host, see [1], appendix I,

$$\hat{H}_{\mathrm{RKKY}} = -\sum_{\mathbf{R},\mathbf{R}'} J(\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R}')\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathbf{R}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{\mathbf{R}'} \qquad (151)$$

with the exchange interaction between two spins at distance $\mathbf{R}$

$$J(\mathbf{R}) = \left(\frac{V}{L}\right)^2 \sum_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{p}} \frac{n^{\mathrm{FS}}_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}(1-n^{\mathrm{FS}}_{\mathbf{p},\uparrow})}{\epsilon(\mathbf{p})-\epsilon(\mathbf{k})} e^{-\mathrm{i}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{p})\cdot\mathbf{R}} . \qquad (152)$$

With $\mathbf{p}' = \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{p}$ and with eqs. (79) and (83) we can cast the exchange interaction into the form

$$J(\mathbf{R}) = -(-1)^{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\epsilon_1 \int_{-\infty}^{0} \mathrm{d}\epsilon_2 \frac{V^2}{\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2} D_{A/B}(\epsilon_1,\mathbf{R}) D_{A/B}(\epsilon_2,\mathbf{R}) . \qquad (153)$$

Apparently, the RKKY exchange interaction changes its sign when we go from the A-lattice to the B-lattice, as it should.

Eq. (153) gives the qualitatively correct dependence on $\mathbf{R}$ only when $\mathbf{R} \in A$-lattice, namely $J(\mathbf{R}) \propto d^2_{\mathbf{R}}$. For $\mathbf{R} \in B$-lattice, second-order perturbation theory is not accurate enough because it does not account for the level splitting shown in Fig. 1. Therefore, it does not reproduce the correct behavior $J(\mathbf{R}) \propto d^2_{\mathbf{R}}$ for $\mathbf{R} \in B$-lattice.

References

[1] J. Sólyom, Fundamentals of the Physics of Solids (Springer, Berlin, 2009), Vols. 1-3.
[2] A. C. Hewson, The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermions (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
[3] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **124**, 41–53 (1961).
[4] J. Friedel, The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science **43**, 153–189 (1952).
[5] J. Friedel, Advances in Physics **50**, 539–595 (2001).
[6] M. A. Ruderman and C. Kittel, Phys. Rev. **96**, 99–102 (1954).
[7] T. Kasuya, Progress of Theoretical Physics **16**, 58–63 (1956).
[8] K. Yosida, Phys. Rev. **106**, 893–898 (1957).
[9] S. Alexander and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **133**, A1594–A1603 (1964).
[10] T. Jabben, N. Grewe, and S. Schmitt, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 045133 (2012).
[11] A. K. Mitchell and R. Bulla, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 155101 (2015).
[12] J. Bünemann, Z. Mahmoud, and F. Gebhard, *Gutzwiller variational treatment of the two-impurity Anderson model*, (2017), in preparation.
[13] S. Nishimoto, T. Pruschke, and R. M. Noack, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **18**, 981–995 (2006).
[14] Mathematica, Version 9.0 (Wolfram Research, Inc., Champaign, 2012).
[15] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions (ninth printing Dover, New York, 1964).

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher